

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

10 RAYMOND WRIGHT, et al.,
11 Plaintiff(s),
12 v.
13 JACOB TRANSPORTATION, LLC,
14 Defendant(s).
15

Case No. 2:15-cv-00056-JAD-NJK
ORDER
(Docket No. 61)

16 Based on the Court's preliminary review of the docket, it appears a discovery plan was required
17 to be filed in this case in July 2015, or roughly two and a half years ago. *See* Docket No. 28 (granting
18 parties' stipulation staying discovery and requirement to file a discovery plan until July 6, 2015); *see*
19 *also* Docket No. 30 at 10 (ordering that the discovery plan must be filed within 14 days of Judge
20 Dorsey's ruling on the motion for conditional certification); Docket No. 35 (order from Judge Dorsey
21 resolving motion for conditional certification on June 24, 2015). Currently before the Court is a
22 "request" by Plaintiff that the undersigned hold a telephonic hearing and enter a discovery plan. Docket
23 No. 61. As a threshold matter, parties must file motions supported by points and authorities, Local Rule
24 7-2(d), that include meaningfully developed argument, *see, e.g., Kor Media Group, LLC v. Green*, 294
25 F.R.D. 579, 582 n.3 (D. Nev. 2013).¹ Plaintiff's request fails on both fronts.²

26
27 ¹ Seeking a hearing is not a substitute for filing a proper motion. *Cf.* Local Rule 78-1.

28 ² The discovery plan attached is also non-compliant with the local rules in numerous respects.

1 In short, a proper motion explaining a basis for the relief sought has not been made, and the
2 pending “request” is therefore **DENIED** without prejudice. Any motion for the relief sought must
3 provide thorough explanation of the procedural history of this case and why the relief sought is properly
4 granted.³

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 DATED: November 3, 2017

7 
8 NANCY J. KOPPE
9 United States Magistrate Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25
26 ³ Counsel is informed that there are no “magistrates” in the federal court system, and there have not
27 been for nearly three decades. *See, e.g., Williams v. City of Mesa*, 2010 WL 2803880, at *2 n.1 (D. Ariz.
28 July 15, 2010).